

DEC 6 1909

## THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

VOL. III

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 4, 1909

No. 8

In the August number of The Atlantic Monthly is a short novel, entitled *Cecily*, by William J. Hopkins. In the second chapter there occurs the following paragraph:

I have had all my time planned out for some while. It will be pretty thoroughly occupied with teaching my son and seeing that he has enough Latin and Greek. Now that these studies have gone out of fashion with the colleges, there is nobody to see that a boy gets enough of them unless his father sees to it. There is nothing to take their place; nothing else that will do, for a boy, just what they did. Modern methods! I snap my fingers at modern methods. I have seen enough of the results of so-called modern methods in my own teaching. There are no results.

It is interesting to have the value of the Classics emphasized thus casually where the appreciation will reach a large number of readers. It is also interesting to have the futility of modern methods so strongly stressed. It occurs to me to wonder whether the term 'modern methods' may not also have been intended to apply to the Classics. For surely during the last twenty years there has been a great deal said about modern methods and I wonder whether other non-teachers could say the same thing with regard to the modern methods of teaching Latin. For is not this period the period of beginners' books in which enough grammar is included to render the use of a grammar in addition unnecessary? And is not this the period when every means is emphasized to stimulate interest, this interest being according to the idea of the teacher rather than of the pupil? And is not this the period during which the reading of the secondary schools has been restricted more and more closely to a few set books? And is this not the period when the examination in prose composition based on a passage in the author read has had the greatest vogue? It seems to me that all of these—you may not call them methods, but certainly devices—would go under the name of 'modern methods'.

And have there really been no results? It is a question upon which people are not agreed and yet the tendency of criticism as exemplified in the remarks of college officers charged with the administration of studies in recent years has been distinctly in the negative and the reports of the College Entrance Examination Board seem to imply the same. In the report of last year, for example, the statis-

tics indicate that the least favorable showing was made in Latin.

The report also says, "About four-fifths of the candidates failed to receive 60 per cent in elementary prose composition and advanced prose composition. About three-fifths of the candidates failed to receive 60 per cent in Caesar, Cicero, and sight translation".

The fact that the difference between the results in prose composition and Caesar, Cicero and sight translation is only one-fifth is an indication that relatively better work is done in the more difficult subject, prose composition, than in the other; consequently such criticism cannot be directed towards the vagaries of any one paper. The percentage of candidates obtaining a rating between 90 and 100 and 75 and 89 per cent is so instructive that I have subjoined it.

	% ratings 90-100	% ratings 75-89	% ratings 60-74
Latin a. i. Grammar .....	0.9	11.3	42.4
ii. Elementary Prose Composition ....	0.5	5.0	16.8
b. Caesar .....	1.3	11.2	28.4
c. Cicero .....	0.7	9.0	26.3
d. Vergil, Aeneid I-VI..	2.5	16.4	36.5
e. Nepos .....	0.0	0.0	0.0
be. Caesar and Nepos.....	2.0	20.0	36.0
f. Sallust .....	0.0	0.0	14.3
g. Ovid .....	0.0	0.0	21.4
i. Prose Composition....	0.1	3.4	16.2
m. Elementary Sight Translation of Prose	1.0	10.0	28.9
p. Advanced Sight Translation of Prose....	0.0	7.9	39.7
q. Sight Translation of Poetry .....	0.9	4.5	35.5
dg. Aeneid I-VI and Sight	0.0	5.5	38.2

Surely these results from our methods after four years of instruction are not encouraging. Is the fault with the methods, is the fault with the examinations, is the fault with the requirements? Personally I feel that the fault lies primarily with the requirements, next with the methods, and least of all with the examinations. These are always set with a view to laying stress upon knowledge of essentials and of the work covered. They could hardly be easier to be examinations at all and the scrutiny that they have to pass from the Board of Review makes it clear that they are not regarded as

unfair. That between 1,000 and 1,200 students should study Latin grammar, elementary prose composition, Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil for the time required in the secondary schools and make as poor a showing on examinations which have been carefully scrutinized makes the question of decision an easy one. The fault lies in the combination of methods and requirements or it lies in the organization of the schools and in the feeling which prompts numerous parents to have their children study Latin when they are mentally unqualified for it.

The thoughts evoked by Mr. Hopkins's paragraph are the more insistent because in the same number of *The Atlantic Monthly* is an article by Dr. Edmiston on Classical Education in America in which he excoriates the aims and methods pursued here, holding up as a terrible example his own experience. It would be too mild to say that he has no words of commendation for our system. He has really no words strong enough to characterize what he regards as its utter futility. He expressly declines to suggest any definite measures of relief, which is a pity because in the multitude of suggestions there lies the possibility of a solution.

Meanwhile, however, it would be well for classical teachers everywhere to ponder the results of the College Board examinations. Such results are not new in their experiences, but their publication may stimulate them to action.

G. L.

**Vergil's Debt  
to the  
Hecuba and Troades of Euripides.**

(Concluded from Page 52)

The cry of Aeneas (1.94-99)

O terque quartusque beati,  
quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis  
contigit oppetere!

saevis ubi Acacidae telo iacet Hector  
is the thought of Cassandra (*Troades* 386-389)

Τρῶες δὲ πρῶτον μέν, τὸ κάλλιστον κλέος,  
ὑπὲρ πάτρας ἔθυσκον· οὐδὲ δύο δόρυ,  
νεκροί γ' ἐσ οἴκους φερόμενοι φιλων ὑπο  
ἐν γῇ πατρῷ περιβολὰς εἰχον χθονός.

A choral ode of the *Troades* tells of the fatal horse and furnishes Vergil with more material for Aeneas's story. It begins with an invocation like Musa, mihi causas memora (Aen. 1.8), thus (see *Troades* 511-514):

ἀμφὶ μοι Ἰλιον, δὲ  
Μούσα, καινῶν ὕμνων  
ἄεισον ἐν δακρύσις ψᾶν ἐπικήδειον.

Then follow *Troades* 519-521:

Διεπον ἵππον οὐράνια  
βρέμοντα χρυσεοφύλαρον ὄνο—  
πλον ἐν πύλαις Ἀχαιοί.

These verses are reproduced in Aen. 2.15, 20:

instar montis equum . . . . .  
uterumque armato milite complent.

A certain thought occurred to the Trojans of the *Troades* and to those of the *Aeneid*; compare *Troades* 524-526

*'Ιτ', δέ πεπανμένοι πόνων,  
τοῦδε ιερὸν ἀνάγετε ξόανον  
Ίλιαδί Διογενῆ Κόρη.*

with Aen. 2.32.33

primusque Thymoetes  
duci intra muros hortatur et arce locari.

In the play, as in the *Aeneid*, they prepared a joyful reception for the image; compare *Troades* 527-532, 537-541, 545-550

*τίς οὐδὲ ἔβα νεαρίδων,  
τίς οὐδὲ γεραιὸς ἐκ δόμων;  
κεχαρρένος δὲ δοιδαῖς  
δόλιον ἕσχον ἄταν  
πᾶσα δὲ γέννα Φρυγῶν  
πρὸς πύλας ὥρμαθη.*

κλωπτοῦ δὲ ἀμφιβόλοις λίνοιο ναὸς ὧστε  
σκάφος κελυνόν, εἰς ἔδραν  
λάνα δάπεδά τε φόνια πατρί—  
δι Παλλαδὸς θέσταν θεᾶς.

παρθένοι δὲ  
άριον ἀνὰ κρότον ποδῶν  
βοῶν ἐμελπον εὐφρο', ἵν  
δόμοις δὲ παμφάε σέλας  
πυρὸς μέλαιναν αἴγλαν  
ἀκος ἔδωκεν ὑπνῳ

with Aen. 2.235-237, 238-240, 245, 252-253:

Accingunt omnes operi, pedibusque rotarum  
subiecti lapsus, et stuppea vincula collo  
intendunt.

Pueri circum innuptaeque puellae  
sacra canunt, funemque manu contingere  
gaudent.

Illa subit, mediaeque minans inlabitur urbi.

Et monstrum infelix sacrata sistimus arce.

fusi per moenia Teucri  
conticuere, sopor fessos complectitur artus:

In *Troades* 581, Andromache says πρὸν ποτ' ἡμεν; in 1292 the chorus exclaims οἰδ' ἔτι έστι Τροία and so in 2.325 Aeneas cries, *fuit Ilium*.

As one of the chief incidents of the *Hecuba* is the fate of Polyxena, so the *Troades* is concerned with the fates of Andromache, Astyanax and Cassandra. The wife of Hector tells her story (*Troades* 658-660):

ἔπει γὰρ ἡρίθην  
Αχιλλέως με πᾶς ἴβουλήθη λαβεῖν  
δάμαρτα δουλεύσω δὲν αἴθεντῶν δόμοις.

Aeneas finds her in the land of Pyrrhus, where she says (3.325-327) :

*Nos, patria incensa, diversa per aquora vectae,  
stirpis Achilleae fastus iuvenemque superbum  
servitio enixaer, tulumus . . .*

Astyanax, by order of the Greeks, was torn from his mother's arms and cast from the wall of Troy. The parting of Andromache with her son and Hecuba's reception of his dead body are agonizing scenes of the Troades. Vergil refers to the fate of Astyanax in the words of Andromache to Ascanius (3.488-491) :

*Cape dona extrema tuorum,  
O mihi sola mei super Astyanactis imago;  
sic oculos, sic ille manus, sic ora ferebat;  
et nunc aequali tecum pubesceret aevo.*

In Troades 69 Cassandra's story is begun by Athena who complains to Poseidon :

*οὐκ οἰσθ' ὑβρισθεῖσάν με καὶ ναὸς ἐμούς;*

Poseidon answers (70) :

*οἴδ', ἡγίκ' Αἴας εἶλκε Κασσάνδραν βίᾳ.*

In Aen. 1.39-41 Juno, in a similar mood, refers to this :

*Pallasne exurere classem  
Argivom atque ipsos potuit submergere ponto,  
unius ob noxam et furias Aiakis Oilei?*

Hecuba dreads to see Cassandra meet the Greeks because of her madness (Troades 169-172) :

*μή νύ μοι τὰν  
ἐκβακχεύονταν Κασσάνδραν,  
αἰσχύναν Ἀργείουσν,  
πέμψητ' ἔξω,  
μανάδ', ἐπ' ἀλγει δ' ἀλγυνθῶ.*

Talthybius replies to the anxious inquiry of Hecuba that Agamemnon has chosen Cassandra for his bride. At this impiety Hecuba exclaims (Troades 253-254) :

*ἡ τὰν τοῦ Φοίβου παρθένον, φέρας ὁ  
χρυσοκόμας ἔδωκ' ἀλεκτρον ζάν;*

But Cassandra sings a wedding hymn and bids her mother rejoice, for by this marriage shall Troy be avenged. Then she predicts dire misfortunes for the Greeks, and, through her agency, the death of Agamemnon with all its attendant woes. But Talthybius speaks gently because of the curse upon her (Troades 408-410, 417-419) :

*εἰ μή σ' Ἀπόλλωνος ἔσεβάχενεν φέρας  
οὐ τὰν ἀμυθί τοὺς ἐμοὺς στρατηλάτας  
τουαισθε φῆμαις ἔξεπεμπετες ἀν χθονός.*

*καὶ στοὶ μέν—οὐ γάρ ἀρτίας ἔχεις φέρας—  
Ἀργεῖ ὄνειδη καὶ Φρυγῶν ἐπανέστεις  
ἀνέμοις φέρεσθαι παραδίδωμι.*

Aeneas has the same thought (2.246-247) :

*Tunc etiam fatis aperit Cassandra futuris  
ora, dei iussu non umquam credita Teucris.*

He adds the story of her betrothal to Coroebus and the picture of her capture when she was dragged by the hair from the temple of Minerva.

To Euripides war meant not the joy and the glory of the victors, but the sorrows and wretchedness of the vanquished. "The consummation of a great conquest is in truth a great misery", says Professor Murray in the preface of his translation of the Troades, and later, in the same introductory note, he declares that the Trojan Women "is perhaps, in European literature, the first great expression of the spirit of pity for mankind exalted into a moving principle". The Aeneid is another expression of this principle. In both are the homesick longing of the exile, grief for the loss of friends and country, horror for the helpless fate of the women allotted as slaves to the victors.

The women are part of the spoil (Troades 28-29) :

*πολλοῖς δὲ κακυτοῖσιν αἰχμαλωτιῶν  
βοῇ Σκάμανδρος δεσπότας κληρονυμένων.*

Aeneas describes the treasure of Troy collected in a temple and guarded by Phoenix and Ulysses (2.766-767) :

*pueri et pavidae longo ordine matres  
stant circum.*

The chorus of Trojan Women is full of fears as to its fate (Troades 161-162, 183-191) :

*. . . . . ἡ πού μ' ἥδη  
νανθλώσονται πατρίας ἐκ γῆς;  
Chorus: ἐκπληγθεῖσ' ἥλθον φρίκη.  
ἥδη τις ἔβα Δαναῶν κῆρυξ;  
τῷ πρόσκειμαι δούλα τλάμων.*

*Hecuba: ἐγγύς πον κείσαι κλήρον.  
Chorus: ίω ίω*

*τίς μ' Ἀργείων ἡ Φθιωτᾶν  
ἡ νησιῶν μ' ἀξει χώραν  
δύστανον πόρσω Τροίας;*

*Hecuba: φεῦ φεῦ  
τῷ δ' ἀ τλάμων  
ποῦ πῆ γαίας δονλεύσω γραῦς;*

Talthybius, the herald, is greeted with breathless questions (Troades 244-245) :

*τίν' ἄρα τις ἔλαχε; τίνα πότμος εὐτυχῆς  
Ιλιάδων μίνει;*

This is the thought of Andromache in Aen. 3.321-324:

*O felix una ante alias Priameia virgo,  
hostilem ad tumulum Troiae sub moenibus altis  
iussa mori, quae sortitus non pertulit ullos,  
nec victoris eri tetigit captiva cubile!*

Creusa consoles her husband for her loss by saying (2.785-786)

*Non ego Myrmidonum sedes Dolopumve superbas  
aspiciam aut Graiis servitum matribus ibo.*

Pitiful farewells are said in Troades 173-174, 1092-1093, 1100-1106:

*Τροία, Τροία δύσταν', ἵρρεις,  
δύσταναι δὲ οἱ στρατόποντες.*

*Μάτερ, ὡμοι, μόναν δή μ' Ἀχαιοὶ κομί—  
ζουσι σίθεν ἀπ' ὄμράτων.*

*εἴθ — πέσοι — πῦρ,  
Ιλιόθεν ὅτε με πολιθακρυν*

*Ἐλλάδε λάτρευμα γῆθεν ἔχορίζει.*

With these we may compare Aen. 3.10-11:

Litora cum patriae lacrimans portusque relinquo  
et campos, ubi Troia fuit; feror exsul in altum.

The thought is summed up in certain verses of Professor Murray's translation of the Troades

And forth, lo, the women go,  
The crown of War, the crown of Woe,  
To bear the children of the foe,  
And weep, weep for Ilion!

H. MAY JOHNSON.

EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, Washington, D. C.

#### REJOINDERS

When a reviewer confines himself to facts, the author of the book reviewed can only be grateful for the attention bestowed upon his work. But when a reviewer takes a different course, it becomes not only the right but also the duty of the author to make answer. It is on the basis of these general principles that I submit the following considerations in answer to the review of my First Year Latin, published by Mr. B. W. Bradley in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.38.

Mr. Bradley asserts first: "Most of the sentences in the exercises are not taken from ancient authors but are created". This is untrue. Relatively few of the sentences were created by me. My procedure was as follows: When I desired to use a word in an exercise, I took the Menge-Preuss Lexicon and hunted till I found a citation adapted to my purpose. The great bulk of the sentences were secured in this way. At times a word was changed, irrelevant words were omitted, or parts of two sentences were amalgamated into one, but I rarely attempted to create.

Mr. Bradley further proceeds to charge that in these alleged creations I display carelessness and a lack of true feeling for Latin. Thus he asserts that "we find non-Caesarian, unusual, or false connotation in the use of words". As examples he cites *castella ponere* (p. 92); *impetum ferre* (119); *custodiam tradidit* (145); *manu* for *multitudine* (155); *etiam* for *quoque* (181); *opus est copiam frumenti nancisci* (194). Let us take these up in order. *Castella ponere* is alleged by Mr. Bradley to be non-Caesarian, unusual, or false. On the other hand it is Caesarian and correct. One has but to turn to the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae to see that the expression is not unusual. Caesar uses it in B. C. 3.58.1, and this suggested to me its employment. Similarly

Mr. Bradley regards *impetum ferre* as non-Caesarian, unusual, or false. But this expression occurs no fewer than eleven times in Caesar alone, viz. B. G. 3.19.3; 4.35.2; 5.21.5; 6.8.6; B. C. 2.25.5, 34.3; 3.37.6, 51.2, 64.1, 93.2, 93.4. My sentence was based particularly on B. G. 5.21.5. *Custodiam tradidit* (the next object of Mr. Bradley's censure) is Caesarian, occurring B. C. 3.39.1 *isdem custodiam navium longarum tradidit*, which suggested my sentence at p. 145. In criticizing my use of *manu* (p. 155) Mr. Bradley says I ought to have used *multitudine*. He adds: "*manus* means an organized force; organization is a quality which Caesar does not usually attribute to the Gauls". This definition of *manus* will surprise many. The lexicons define the word as 'host', 'multitude', 'Schar', 'Haufen'. However, the best test for our purpose is Caesar's actual usage. In B. G. 5.39.3 we read *magna manu Eburones legionem oppugnare incipiunt*, on the basis of which I use the sentence *Galli cum magna manu hoc oppidum oppugnare coeperunt* (p. 155), condemned by Mr. Bradley as one of my non-Caesarian, unusual, or false creations. In B. G. 5.26.2 we have further, *magna manu ad castra oppugnatum venerunt*; so also 5.8.6, 27.8; 1.37.4; and often. According to Menge-Preuss, this sense of *manus* ('Schar', 'Haufen') is the predominant one in Caesar. In fact, they do not recognize the occurrence of the word in the sense claimed by Mr. Bradley. At p. 181, according to Mr. Bradley, I use *etiam* where I ought to have used *quoque*. *Redde etiam* are the words at issue. *Redde quoque*, however, is impossible here for the reason (familiar to most certainly) that *quoque* is not used by Caesar after verbs<sup>1</sup>. Lest it be urged that Mr. Bradley means *redde obsides quoque*, let me say that that would not convey my meaning, as must be obvious to all. Post-positive *etiam*, by the way, is so common in Caesar and all the best classical Latin as to need no defence. At p. 194 I use the sentence: *opus est copiam frumenti nancisci*. For the phrase *copiam frumenti mancisci* see B. G. 7.32.1. For *opus est* with the infinitive see 7.54.1. The foregoing are illustrations cited by Mr. Bradley as showing that the sentences in my exercises are non-Caesarian, unusual, or false, and that my book is prepared without care or a true feeling for the Latin language. In other words, the very sentences and expressions which I have scrupulously taken from the great master of Latin prose himself are condemned. In effect what I am chidden for is that, having undertaken to write a book based on Caesar, I did not use Mr. Bradley's Latin instead of Caesar's. This attitude is continued in Mr. Bradley's criticism of the sentence (p. 165), *ipsa loci natura periculum repellebat*, although these are Caesar's *ipsissima verba*, having been taken from B. C. 1.79.2 (not

<sup>1</sup> In fact, *quoque* with finite verbs is practically, if not quite, unknown to classical Latin.

created by me). Mr. Bradley objects to the use of *ipse* with an abstract noun, but Caesar uses *ipse* elsewhere with abstracts with some freedom, e. g. B. G. 7.38.3 *ex ipsa caede*; 5.33.1 *ipso negotio*; 4.33.1 *ipso terrore*; 1.53.6 *ipsa victoria*; B. C. 1.86.1 *ipsa significatione*; 3.79.3 *ipsa fortuna*, to say nothing of Cicero's free use of *ipse* with abstracts, e. g. *ipsa veritas*, etc. The plural of *vita*, also, though criticized by Mr. Bradley, has excellent classical warrant; cf. Nat. Deor. 1.20.52, *deus qui hominum commoda vitasque tueatur*; De Div. 1.11.17 *sensus hominum vitasque*; Lael. 23.87 *serpit nescio quo modo per omnium vitas amicitia*. Further examples from Cicero and other good writers might easily be added to the above list. Other Caesarian expressions used in my book, but condemned by Mr. Bradley, are: p. 92, *in locis superioribus*, which I took from B. G. 7.79; *finibus excedere* (p. 150), found in B. G. 4.18; 7.77.14.

The word order of my sentences is also censured. On p. 108 I have *salute communi*. Mr. Bradley thinks it should be *communi salute*. But Cicero writes *salus communis* in Verr. 1.22; 4.52; and in at least a dozen (probably two score) other passages. Certainly there is nothing illogical, as Mr. Bradley claims, in *salute communi*.

Mr. Bradley also charges me with using constructions which are not explained, and cites as a capital instance the frequent use of the historical present. But I state in the clearest terms on p. 82 on the occasion of the first occurrence of the historical present: "The present with the force of the perfect (is) a very common usage in Latin. It is called the Historical Present".

In conclusion I must submit that Mr. Bradley's figures as to the nature of the vocabulary I have used in my book seem to me as misleading as most of his other observations. I wish only to say that of my 767 words 500 are used 20 times or more in Caesar; 693 are used 10 times or more. Only 61 words employed in the exercises are used in Caesar fewer than 10 times, while 13 words (none of them unusual, e. g. *donec*, *quondam*, *melior*, *agricola*, *incola*, *exitium*, *culpo*, *felix*, and five more) are not found in Caesar, though all of them occur in Cicero. The reader will get a different impression, I fear, from Mr. Bradley's statement.

Mr. Bradley's review abounds in numerous other misrepresentations of my book and of Latin usage, but the foregoing will suffice to show the essential recklessness and injustice of his article.

The foregoing observations were written before the publication of the second installment of Mr. Bradley's review. Examination of this second installment shows its nature to be like that of its predecessor. Thus Mr. Bradley declares that I omit to mention that in purpose clauses *quo* is regularly used with comparatives, whereas I state clearly

on p. 173 that such is the case. I am said to use "regularly" for "always" when I state that before *er* the *i* is regularly short in *fio*. But "always" would be incorrect. Neue gives over thirty instances of long *i* in *fierem* and *fieri*. I am by implication charged with error in calling *Carthagini* and *Athenis* ablative. Mr. Bradley seems to consider them locatives. But neither Lindsay, Sommer, Brugmann, Giles, Henry, or any other investigator known to me takes this view. *Carthagini* is historically an ablative; *Athenis* is historically an instrumental, which, like all other ablatives, shares the tripartite functions of the ablative case. Mr. Bradley also questions the employment of *quoniam* with the subjunctive. In Nepos 1.7.5 the text is: *is quoniam pro se dicere non posset, verba fecit frater eius*. But it is unnecessary to multiply instances of Mr. Bradley's method.

CHAS. E. BENNETT.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

I desire to supplement a review of my Latin Forms and Syntax which appeared in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.28.

(1) In the treatment of the forms, the student is trained from the outset to distinguish the different resultant forms of each declension. In the verbs, the formation of the regular verbs is strongly emphasised so that the irregular verbs are easily learned. The synthetic method is not followed where it is impracticable. The most convincing argument, however, is that of results. The work has passed the experimental stage and identifications are not only rapid but exact.

(2) Just as the nouns, verbs, etc., are each treated in solido, so each logical division of the syntax is treated as a whole. In addition, some attempt is made to illustrate or explain rules of syntax, where it seemed feasible, on the ground that a rule is more readily remembered and applied, when it is understood, than when it is arbitrarily stated as mere convention. The wisdom of this procedure may be debatable, but the result—the intelligent comprehension of the student—can hardly be questioned. Briefly, the work pursues in the forms and syntax a line mid-way between the logico-conventional method of Bennett and the piecemeal treatment of Collar and Daniel.

(3) With regard to the vocabulary, all the words used in the exercises on syntax are repeated in the exercises on the forms. The exercises on the forms, moreover, are themselves vocabulary drills, as well as drills on the forms, a fact which will be evident to the most casual observer. In the general vocabulary there are 661 nouns and verbs, including all compounds. In the separate chapter vocabularies, to be memorized in connection with the exercises, there are 245 words, and in the exercises on the forms and vocabulary combined there are 160 words, making in

all 405 of the commonest words in Caesar, Book I, to be memorized.

(4) There are fifty chapters, logically arranged. There are eighty lessons, which, in the judgment of the teacher, could be subdivided into about 100 lessons.

R. H. LOCKE.

Philadelphia.

I am glad to see that Professor Rolfe in reviewing the translation of Friedländer's *Sittengeschichte* in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.54 bestows well deserved censure on the translator of the first volume. It is astonishing that any publisher would accept such a wretched piece of work, and lamentable that we should have to refer our pupils to it, unless, indeed, we are to use it as an *exemplum in terrorem*. I must, however, vindicate the translator in one small detail criticised by Professor Rolfe. On p. 163 it is stated that many small advocates were "too glad [sic] to devil four speeches for a piece of gold"; Professor Rolfe ingeniously conjectures that "devil" is a misprint for "deliver". The word 'devil', however, is in quite regular use among English lawyers; the minor barrister who gets up cases for a leading counsel is said to devil for him, or to do his deviling, or to be his devil. But I should readily admit that in a translation in which the use of English idiom is conspicuously avoided it would have been better to employ a less esoteric term. One is tempted to surmise that in this translation Mr. Magnus himself employed a devil, as he has recently brought out a work on Victorian Literature which seems to be written in a very different style. G. M. HIRST.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

In his note on the omission of the accents in written or printed Greek in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.247 Mr. Deixel falls into a mistake which, I fear, would become all too common with our Greek students, if Greek accents were omitted. He says that the advanced student should "get the accent of new words as he gets the accent of address and address". As a matter of fact, no reputable English dictionary that I can find even hints at any other accent than address for both noun and verb.

GEO. A. WILLIAMS.

KALAMAZOO COLLEGE, Mich.

[Professor Williams's point is well taken. The pronunciation address is a colloquialism prevalent in some sections of the United States even among cultivated people.—ED.]

Upon Thursday, December 30, at the meeting of the American Historical Association in New York City, a conference will be held in ancient history. The programme includes papers by the following well-known workers in that field: Professor Henry B. Wright of Yale University, Professor Nathaniel

Schmidt of Cornell University, Professor W. S. Ferguson of Harvard University, and Professor Eduard Meyer of Berlin. Classical teachers of the East, who may be in New York City at that time, are cordially invited to attend the conference.

I am very anxious to have a good representation at this meeting, as it is the first time in the history of the American Historical Association that ancient history has been given a hearing.

W. L. WESTERMANN.

Madison, Wisconsin.

#### THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The first luncheon of the New York Latin Club for the year 1909-1910 was held at the Hotel Marlborough, Saturday, November 20. There were seventy-seven present, a larger number than we have had at any luncheon during the past two years, but not large enough; we should make it an even hundred at the next meeting, which will be held January 8.

Professor Julius Sachs, of Columbia University, read a very stimulating paper entitled Improved Standards of Teaching Latin. Among the points emphasized were the teacher's need of deeper literary and historical insight in the study of Latin; the need of teachers that can and will do vigorous teaching; greater knowledge of the efforts of the past; the unusual should be slighted, the common emphasized; first, forms, then, syntax; it is not the difficulty of the subject, but the lack of definiteness on the part of the teacher, that causes failure; use more illustrative material; end to be sought, not quantity, but quality; beginning work should cover a year and a half; the success of Latin depends on the scholarship of the teacher, who should be a specialist of high general scholarship. In such a brief résumé it is of course impossible to do justice to this excellent paper, and we trust that it will be published in such a form that it may be brought before every teacher of the Classics in the city.

The discussion was opened by Professor Lodge, the President of the Club; he was followed by Dr. Vlyman, Principal of the Eastern District High School, and Dr. Gunnison, Principal of Erasmus Hall High School. Dr. Vlyman said that the forms should be learned more carefully; unusual forms and constructions should be omitted; and the amount of Latin for minute examination should be made smaller. Dr. Gunnison thought that, considering the preparation of the pupils that we receive in our high schools, it might be wise to extend the beginning work in Latin over a year and a half; but the vocabulary should be confined to words found in Caesar.

The following motion proposed by Miss McVay of Wadleigh High School, and seconded by Mr. Harter of Erasmus Hall High School, was passed:

*Resolved*, that the New York Latin Club, recognizing the great need of a uniform grammatical no-

menclosure in all the languages taught in the schools, hereby signifies its interest in the work of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology recently formed in England, and requests that the grammars used in America be likewise taken into account.

It was also voted that Dr. Avellanus should be invited to speak at a special meeting of the Club, on the use of Latin in conversation.

Usurping the functions of the censor, we may call attention to two or three points. The luncheon did not begin at 12 o'clock sharp. The delay was caused by the fact that the speaker could not be present until 12.30. We can assure the members of the Club that, *Deo volente*, the next luncheon will begin at the time advertised. The room in which the luncheon was served was too small, over-heated and noisy. The hotel management has promised a larger room for the next luncheon, and for the address a special room far removed from the sound of pans and kettles.

WILLIAM F. TIBBETTS.

ERASMUS HALL HIGH SCHOOL, Brooklyn.

#### TWO KINDS OF REALISM<sup>1</sup>

In the past days the National Museum at Rome and our own Metropolitan Museum have put on exhibition each a Greek statue displaying the unusual character of realism. Yet a greater contrast than these two marbles afford can hardly be imagined. One has to remind himself that the Temple Ministrant of Rome, a mere serving maid at her work, is not a nymph or even a goddess, while at first glance the Old Market Woman of the Metropolitan strikes one as a bad *genre* piece of no very ancient date. Yet both were cut by Grecian hands, presumably not a century, either way, from the Venus of Milo. On close scrutiny also, the nobler figure of the two appears the most conscientiously realistic, while the meaner form is prettified for effect. We have to do with contrasting ideals of Greek realism, and since realism is the leading artistic motive of our generation, a comparison of the two manners should be instructive.

First, as nearer at hand, we will look at the Old Market Woman. She strains forward crying her wares. The whole body is contorted as by a sort of recoil from her vociferation. Her right arm, now missing, brandished a dainty before a possible buyer; her left clasps two fowls to her side while the hand holds a laden basket. Her brow and exposed breasts display the outrages of time, but her legs and sandalled feet have through the drapery the easy elegance of a Tanagra statuette. The artist has flinched from creating a complete effigy of shrivelled decrepitude. No Greek has given us the tragic fact embodied so pitifully in Rodin's Armorer's Wife. This Market Woman is caught at her most energetic moment, at one of those instants in which she defied her habitual lassitude. Surely, the theme is highly characteristic. Why, then, is the impression of the thing so unsatisfying? An examination of the Temple Ministrant will go far to answer the question.

The Temple Ministrant at Rome is plainly a daughter of the people. Her sturdy body is girt by a clumsy yet decorative mass of drapery rolled tight

to raise the impeding garment from her ankles. Her hair shows nothing of that elaboration which we have come to regard as invariable in Greek sculpture. Two short tresses are drawn forward from the nape of the neck and roughly knotted over the brow—just the easiest method of getting the hair out of the way. The head is as boyish as the figure. The Girl of Anzio, as the Italians call her affectionately after the place of her discovery, is standing intent upon some minor office in the cult. Her left arm bears the fragment of a salver upon which stood some utensil needed for the service. Her firmly poised body betrays her solicitude. The eyes regard the salver fixedly, less with reverence, it seems to us, than with a simple determination that the trifling service shall be well performed. Yet the beauty of this menial action is akin to that of the processional marbles of the Parthenon, and the realistic traits in figure, costume, and hair-dressing so readily adjust themselves to the grand style of the whole that only with difficulty does one perceive that these elements are quite exceptional. The whole thing is of a lofty yet intimate beauty which finds Christian expression in the familiar lines:

Who sweeps a room as for Thy laws  
Makes that and th' action fine.

Between the Temple Ministrant and the Old Market Woman there is an immense difference in workmanship, the latter being quite mediocre in execution, but this difference is transcended by a far deeper discrepancy in vision. Whoever made the Old Market Woman saw her as she chose to be seen, and as every passer-by saw her. He accepted for his theme just the insight of everybody about. Whoever created the beautiful Temple Ministrant managed to see something that probably everybody else overlooked. The common gaze doubtless would have been on the statue of the divinity, or on the officiating priest. It was the artist who caught the simple majesty of that robust figure poised as it held faithfully a cup, a knife, or some such nothing. The joy of that discovery we feel as we look upon the Girl of Anzio.

Yes, the difference transcends technic. You might put the Roman statue through a series of casts and reductions until in handling it became infinitely the inferior of the Old Market Woman, yet it, whatever its debasement, would remain wholly superior as a work of art. It is, as with all creation, a question of vision. If you do your seeing with simple curiosity, accepting unchallenged the average testimony of the eye and the casual observation of all the world, no technical mastery will save the result from cheapness and essential insignificance. The true artist is the aristocrat of the eye. He makes his bold exclusions and stern selections. He looks deep into appearances, and is wary of their immediate appeal. Thus he reveals things that the rest of us are too hurried or too untrained to see at all. Let no one say that the mere age and ugliness of the Old Market Woman are the trouble. She simply is seen too quickly and at the wrong moment. There is now at the Union League Club a picture by Daumier in which market-women and decrepit clerks are huddled into a third-class compartment, and the group and each individual have the sombre distinction that we associate with Michelangelo and Millet. It seems all a matter of the aristocracy of the eye. Otherwise the difference between the artist and the average man would be merely quantitative—only that, for example, between the champion golfer and the awkward amateur.

<sup>1</sup> This article appeared in the New York Evening Post of Saturday, November 20. I am sure our readers will welcome the opportunity to see it at once. It should be read in connection with the account of The Old Market Woman printed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.55.

## The CLASSICAL WEEKLY

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by the Classical Association of the Atlantic States. It is issued weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

The dates of issue of Volume III will be as follows: in 1909, October 2, 9, 16, 23, 30; November 13, 20; December 4, 11, 18; in 1910, January 9, 16, 23, 30; February 6, 13, 20; March 6, 13, 20; April 3, 10, 17, 24; May 1, 8, 15, 22, 29.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

To persons and institutions outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is conducted by the following board of editors:

*Editor-in-Chief*  
GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University  
*Associate Editors*  
CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University  
ERNST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn  
HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University  
*Business Manager*

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

## DE AMICITIA and DE SENECTUTE

A new edition, by E. W. BOWEN of Randolph-Macon College; scholarly and practical for classroom study; embodying the recent interpretation of Cicero. Each book, 75 cents.

D. C. HEATH & CO.

BOSTON

NEW YORK

CHICAGO

## P. TERENTI AFRI COMOEDIAE THE COMEDIES OF TERENCE

Edited with Introduction and Notes

By SIDNEY G. ASHMORE, L.H.D.

Professor of Latin in Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

Complete in one volume, \$1.50

"Prof. S. G. Ashmore has done a real service in preparing this complete edition. For the first time, teacher and student have in a single volume a variety of material which is indispensable to a proper study of Terence. . . . Professor Ashmore's book is marked by sanity, by care, by fine literary instinct, for Professor Ashmore is master of an excellent English style, something all too rare in classical text-books. The introduction discusses clearly and well such topics as the history of Greek and Roman comedy, the plays of Terence, Terence's influence upon literature, and the production of plays."

*The Nation, Sept. 3, 1908.*

Send for complete catalogue.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, American Branch  
35 West 32nd Street, New York

## HELPS FOR THE LATIN TEACHER

Inglis's Latin Composition Exercise Book . . . . \$0.25

Reiley's Practical Exercises on the Latin Verb . . . . 50

Two books of blanks, prepared to combine rapidity with thoroughness, to economize the time of both teacher and pupil, and to give systematic training that will assist greatly in reading and writing Latin.

## AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK      CINCINNATI      CHICAGO      BOSTON

## D'ODGE'S LATIN COMPOSITION FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Presents a

Systematic  
Thorough  
Productive

Course in Latin Composition

The text is based upon the writings of Caesar and Cicero. By this means the pupil is made familiar with the *Style, Idioms, and Vocabulary* of these two authors. The arrangement of *Syntax, References and Notes* is admirable.

GINN AND COMPANY : PUBLISHERS  
70 Fifth Avenue : : New York City

## ABBOTT'S SHORT HISTORY OF ROME

An exceedingly interesting narrative, coupled with historical accuracy and balance in the treatment of periods, makes this book most desirable for an elementary course in the subject.

A large number of Maps and Illustrations.

PROF. FRANK FROST ABBOTT  
Professor of Classics, Princeton University

A Short History of Rome . . . . . \$1.00  
Handbook for Study . . . . . 25

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY  
EDUCATIONAL PUBLISHERS

CHICAGO      ILLINOIS

## CAESAR: THE GALlic WAR

By A. L. HODGES, Instructor in Latin in Wadleigh High School, New York. 12mo. Cloth. Illustrated. XIII + 522 pages. \$1.25 net.

The fourth book in the Macmillan Latin Series edited by Dr. J. C. Kirtland. It includes the seven books of the Commentaries, a comprehensive introduction, helpful notes, and a complete vocabulary.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK  
BOSTON      CHICAGO      ATLANTA      SAN FRANCISCO

## The Students' Series of Latin Classics

59 Books Out and Under Way

LIST SENT ON APPLICATION

BENJ. H. SANBORN & CO.  
156 Fifth Ave., New York